The History of the Family

ISSN: 1081-602X (Print) 1873-5398 (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rhof20

Migration, households, and agrarian reform in the Baltic provinces of Russia: 19th and 20th centuries

Andrejs Plakans

To cite this article: Andrejs Plakans (2006) Migration, households, and agrarian reform in the Baltic provinces of Russia: 19th and 20th centuries, The History of the Family, 11:3, 151-159, DOI: 10.1016/j.hisfam.2006.11.005

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hisfam.2006.11.005

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com
ScienceDirect
History of the Family 11 (2006) 151–159
The History of the Family

Migration, households, and agrarian reform in the Baltic provinces of Russia: 19th and 20th centuries

Andrejs Plakans *

Department of History, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011, United States

Abstract

Earlier research has shown that migration flows affect household size and that these measures in turn are affected by local and regional legal systems that seek to regulate migration. This article explores these connections in those areas of the 19th century Russian Baltic provinces of Livland and Kurland that in the 20th century became the country of Latvia. Different data bases are used to link variables during the decades after the agrarian reforms of the 1816–1819 period, in the decades after the 1860s reforms that made possible the purchase of farmland by peasants, and in the decades after 1920 when the new country of Latvia nationalized land heretofore owned by estates and redistributed it to landless peasants and small farmers. The findings are tentative because the data sources differ substantially from period to period, but the present analysis suggests strong enough connections between agrarian reform, migration, and household size and structure to require a more thorough project.

1. Introduction

The interaction of rural migration, households, and agrarian reform in the Russian Baltic provinces during the 19th century is a complex topic, and the present article does not pretend to be the last word on the subject. Instead, it probes the history of this interaction in three moments in time in the Latvian population of the Baltic provinces: the decades immediately following the peasant emancipation of the 1816–1820 period, the decades between 1860 and 1890 when new reform laws permitted the sale of farmland to peasants–occupiers, and the decades following the Agrarian Reform Law in 1919–1920. These investigatory probes are meant to highlight the issues to be pursued in further research, the usefulness of various types of historical sources, and the hypotheses that can be put forward at the present stage of research.

In the Russian Baltic Provinces of Estland, Livland, and Kurland land reforms of various kinds stretched from the early 1800s through the 19th century well into the 20th, affecting virtually every generation of rural people. Previous research has dealt with rural migration before 1850 and rural to urban migration after 1850 (Plakans & Wetherell, 1995; Wetherell & Plakans, 1997). Here, those findings are summarized within the larger context of land reform in the region, and new data on rural migration in the late 19th century are brought into the longer story.

The general findings of earlier research are reasonably straightforward. Migration levels were high throughout the century, but changed fundamentally after restrictions on migration were lifted in the 1860s. Before the 1860s the

* Tel.: +1 515 292 9538.
E-mail address: aplakans@iastate.edu.

1081-602X/$ - see front matter © 2006 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.
doi:10.1016/j.hisfam.2006.11.005

external migration of peasants, that is, movement crossing the boundaries of any particular landed estate, was extremely limited, and was normally dominated, first, by single men and women moving in and out to marry, and, second, by males conscripted to the Russian army, usually for a period of 25 years. By contrast, internal migration or mobility within the large landed estates that dominated the Baltic agrarian regime was higher, but it was driven by an entirely different dynamic than external migration.[1] Internal migration consisted primarily of farmstead heads and their families periodically relocating to head new farmsteads, and landless farmhands (both male and female) relocating to work on different farmsteads, frequently annually. In a series of reforms starting in 1816, the provincial and Imperial governments began to redefine the relationship of the agricultural population to the land. The reforms had the result of progressively lifting restrictions on peasant movement, permitting, especially after the 1860s, the development of considerable rural-to-urban migration within the Baltic provinces themselves, migration in and out of the Provinces, as well as increased local movement. The cumulative effect of the reforms made migration far more complex a phenomenon in the second half of the 19th century than it had been before. Moreover, the characteristic migration flows of the second half of the century were only the middle part of the longer story, since both agrarian reforms continued into the 20th century and continued also to affect migration and household patterns then.

Historians commonly differentiate among types of movement. In addition to *local* migration where the distance moved is generally short and the accompanying level of social dislocation is low, Tilly (Tilly, 1978, 51–57; Moch, 1992, 16–17) distinguished among *circular* (distance unimportant, but return involved), *chain* (persisters following movers), and *career* (long-distance, no return) migration, in which the underlying context of each type of migration is economic (specifically labour markets). Kertzer and Hogan's (1985, 1989, 1990) and Moch's (1992) studies of the nature and context of local, regional, and continental patterns of migration in Western and Southern Europe show how larger, often state-induced, changes in the "fundamental structures of European economic life: landholding, employment, demographic patterns, and the development of capital" (Moch, 1992, p. 6) affected migration. Yet if movement was always a central feature of European life, what Tilly and others term "local flows" (Tilly, 1978, p. 63) remain the least investigated, and perhaps most common, in traditional European societies, where the spatial worlds of work and community life were constrained by law and habit.

2. Pre-1860 migration

Much of the earlier work on the Latvian areas of the Russian Baltic provinces focused on the landed estate of Pinkenhof, in the Province of Livland, now part of Latvia, between 1790 and 1850 (Plakans & Wetherell, 1988, 1992, 1995, 1998). From the early 17th century until the first third of the 19th serfdom prevailed in the Baltic region. The fundamental unit of agriculture was the estate, which itself was divided into peasant and estate (*demesne*) land. Peasants occupied individual farmsteads and held usufruct rights to residency. In order to have sufficient labour to do obligatory labour on the estate land and to work their own holdings, peasant households normally consisted of both the family of farmstead heads and unrelated farmhands, the latter both male and female, and married and unmarried. Household composition changed predictably over the life cycle, but the size of farmstead households remained roughly the same over time. Falling below an optimal size jeopardized the head's ability to render labour dues and provide for the farmstead itself. At virtually all times, however, farmstead heads worked to gather enough farmhands in residence to protect their own *families*, and to the extent possible coresident kin, from the onerous estate labour obligations (Plakans & Wetherell, 1992).

Critically, the size and number of farmsteads changed little in Pinkenhof over the course of two and half centuries. Since movement out of the estate was severely constrained, farmhands — between 55 and 60% of estate populations — could only move about within the estate according to the labour needs of established farmsteads. Farmhands, moreover, did not live in independent households on farmsteads, but in the household of the farmstead head; some small proportion, 4–5%, lived and worked on the main estate farm, or *Hof*. Socially, the estate agrarian regime created a two-

[1] Geographers and demographers routinely distinguish between *migration* and *mobility.* Conceptually, they base that distinction on the distance people move and on the social impact of that movement. Changing residence constitutes mobility if work, for example, remains close enough not to disrupt other social activities; it constitutes migration if work is not close enough to avoid disruption. Practically, however, the distinction often translates into movement across administrative boundaries, which can pose enormous strategic problems for historians forced to deal with records from separate secular or ecclesiastical divisions.

tiered peasant society: a privileged minority of farmstead heads and their families, and a majority of landless peasants who moved from farm to farm, often on a yearly basis, as single men and women or in small conjugal family units. The movement of groups occurred regularly, but once a family secured a farmstead headship, it tended to hold it for a generation or more. The life chances for a 20-year old male succeeding to the headship of a farmstead were no better than one in four.

The Livland Peasant Emancipation Law of 1819 (Schwabe, 1928; Tobien, 1899) introduced personal freedom and expanded the right of movement, both of which the Livlandic nobility viewed as necessary prerequisites to a free labour market. Yet the new Law did not permit absolute freedom of movement (that right was introduced gradually to different segments of the peasant population), and it formally deprived the peasantry of even those usufruct rights to land they had enjoyed under the old estate regime of serfdom. In principle, peasants were free to sell their labour to the highest bidder. In reality, peasants, now formally landless, did not move away but continued to occupy their old farmsteads in exchange for labor and money rents. The farmhand population remained visible also, since the Emancipation Law entailed no redistribution of land.

The Russian Imperial head-tax censuses or "revisions of souls" for Pinkenhof (in principle, carried out every 15 years), which provide detailed enumerations of the human groupings at the farmstead level from 1782 onward, revealed no massive in- or out-migration in either the pre- or the post-emancipation periods, although both kinds of movement existed to varying degrees. The 1850 revision, however, was more than a simple nominal listing of 1569 residents living on 123 farmsteads, the main estate farm or *Hof* and several smaller, functionally specialized places; it indicated where each of the 1850 residents had lived in 1833. Moreover, if an 1833 inhabitant had left the estate before 1850, his or her departure was noted, together with a date and a destination; if he or she had arrived since 1833, that was noted also, together with the place of origin although not always with the year of arrival. The 1850 revision, therefore, allows us to explore external migration and to a lesser extent, internal mobility.

As in most Baltic landed estates, everyday rural life in Pinkenhof transpired on spatially separated farmsteads, not nucleated villages (Kundzins, 1974). Each of the 123 fixed residential farms in 1850 bore a name that recurs in estate documents as far back as the latter part of the 17th century. New entrants into the estate, therefore, augmented the labour force of particular farmsteads, and those who left diminished it. Correspondingly, internal mobility, took place between farmsteads, and the spatial scope of mobility was confined with the boundaries of individual estates. But Pinkenhofers did move. Between 1833 and 1850, 192 men and women left and entered Pinkenhof, for a net migration rate of −17.7. For females, the rate was 4.1 and for males, −21.7, a discrepancy attributable to a high level of conscription among males (Plakans & Wetherell, 1988). Table 1 displays age-specific external migration rates for both males and females.

Overall, the crude external migration rate, CMRe, was 7.3, but the incidence of migration was greatest for those in their twenties (30.3) who were moving in and out of the estate to marry.[2] The record clearly indicates that external migration, defined as movement across the estate's boundaries, was limited almost exclusively to young adults; for those over forty, it was virtually non-existent.

Internal mobility is more difficult to evaluate, for two reasons. First, the revision only documents the presence of a person in one farmstead in 1833 and in another in 1850; it does not record any intervening moves that might have occurred between those 2 years. Second, the source does not give the ages at which internal migrants moved. All that is known are the ages of 459 people who were at least 18 years old in 1850 and who had changed their farmsteads of residence at least once between 1833 and 1850. At the same time, it seems safe to conclude that movement within the estate — *mobility* — was much greater that movement across estate boundaries — *migration.* For one thing, the ratio of recorded internal to external moves was more than 2:1. For another, it is known that the labour force in Pinkenhof was far from stationary, and that adult farmhands and their children traditionally moved about the estate on a regular basis (Plakans & Wetherell, 1988, 1992; Svarane, 1971). Accordingly, the incidence of external migration in the 1850

[2] At the same time, the neighboring estate of Bebberbeck and others in the adjoining province of Kurland, which were the sources half (44 of 84) of all immigrants and half (38 of 74) of all emigrants (excluding 36 conscripted males), were so geographically close to Pinkenhof that any hard and fast distinction between migration and mobility may blur the historical reality. The crude external migration rate, CMRe, and the corresponding crude internal migration rate, CMR, are calculated as:

$$\frac{\text{Number or external(or internal)migrants}}{\text{Mid} - \text{Year Population, 1833}-1850} * 100$$

Age-specific rates, indicated as CMRe, for example, are equivalent to age specfic birth or death rates. Rogers and Castro (1986) employ a similar age-specific, although less intuitive, measure.

Table 1
Age-specific external migration rates, Pinkenhof (1833–1850)

Age cohort	Mid-period population	*N* migrants	External migration rate CMRe
0–14	490	7	0.8
15–19	162	17	5.8
20–24	140	50	19.8
25–29	145	84	32.2
30–34	129	21	9.0
35–39	104	7	3.7
40–44	85	3	2.0
45–49	63	2	1.8
50–54	61	1	0.9
55+	93	2	1.2
Totals	1472	194	7.3

Source: The Ninth Imperial Revision for Livland, Central National Historical Archive, Riga., Latvia. Baltic Microfilms, Dl 12, Oekonomie Expedition d. Stadtkassakollegiums IV E. 4, Revisionsliste Gut Pinkenhof, J. G. Herder Institut, Marburg a.d. Lann, Germany. Plakans and Wetherell (1995), p.1 60.

revision can be taken as a good reflection of the historical reality and the corresponding level of internal mobility as an absolute minimum.

Table 2 displays hypothetical age-specific internal migration rates for those 18 years of age and older in 1850. The age-specific rates are hypothetical and cannot be taken at face value because they reflect only movement sometime between 1833 and 1850, and do not represent standardized rates of mobility for persons in each age cohort. Only if the 39 peasants who were between 45 and 49 years old in 1850, for example, had actually moved while they were 45 to 49 would the reported age-specific rate be a true rate. Yet a CMR of 26.3 suggests that spatial mobility was a common experience in Pinkenhof. Indeed, Table 2 also reveals that nearly half (47.4%) of the 1850 population at risk had moved at least once within the estate since 1833. It is also known that internal migrants did not move very far, on the average only 2.5 km. Thus local flows, although common, were short.

Despite the weaknesses in the record, five things seem clear about mobility and migration in Pinkenhof in the decades immediately following emancipation. (1) Most spatial movement consisted of local, short distance moves within the estate or to neighboring estates. (2) Internal mobility was common. Perhaps half of all peasants changed their residence at least once in their adult years. (3) External migration was confined to young adults who moved largely to and from neighboring estates in order to marry. (4) Movement of those over thirty was virtually always within the estate. (5) By virtue of their number, internal migrants, far more than external migrants, created the need for any social and psychological adjustments that may have accompanied movement.

What we know about eastern European peasant estates in general, and Pinkenhof in particular, also suggests that the different life experiences of farmstead heads and their families on the one hand, and farmhands on the other hand, affected mobility. Of the 817 adults over 20 in Pinkenhof who lived on the 119 farmsteads with identifiable heads in 1850, half (416) were heads themselves or coresident kin. Of this privileged group, nearly two thirds (268) had resided

Table 2
Hypothetical age-specific internal migration rates, and proportions of 1850 population internally mobile, Pinkenhof (1833–1850)

Age cohort	1850 population	*N* migrants	Internal migration rate CMRI	Percent of population mobile
18–19	76	30	21.9	35.9
20–24	139	79	31.6	56.8
25–29	136	75	30.6	55.1
30–34	125	72	32.0	57.6
45–39	106	53	27.8	50.0
40–44	104	43	23.0	41.3
45–49	85	39	25.5	45.9
50–54	72	31	23.9	43.1
55+	126	37	16.3	29.4
Totals	969	459	26.3	47.4

Source: The Ninth Imperial Revision for Livland, Central National Historical Archive, Riga, Latvia. Baltic Microfilms, Dl 12, Oekonomie Expedition d. Stadtkassakollegiums IV E. 4, Revisionsliste Gut Pinkenhof, J. G. Herder Institut, Marburg a.d. Lann, Germany. Plakans and Wetherell (1995), p.1 62.

on the same farmstead they had in 1833. Conversely, of those 401 adults who were not related to the head of the farmstead on which they lived in 1850, three-quarters (304) had moved at least once since 1833. Among the 121 peasants over 55 in 1850 on these 119 farmsteads, two thirds (86) had not moved since 1833.

For the half of the population who were farmhands, the pressure to move was far more pronounced and regular, for they faced an annual search for new employment. If a farmstead head decided his current farmhands were a drain on resources or were poor workers, he could always let them go and bargain with others to take their places (Plakans and Wetherell, 1988, 1992; Wetherell and Plakans, 1998). Whether farmhands moved every year or every 5 or 10 years, a cycle of movement can be envisaged that created enough turnover to give rise to the traditional folk view that the population of peasant estates was constantly churning. But again, the reason farmhands moved is because they did not have access to land of their own, and would not until the later reforms. State policies that limited movement beyond estate boundaries effectively constrained the agricultural labour market to the estate itself.

3. Post-1860 migration

After the 1816–1819 Emancipation laws, the next large structural change came after 1850. In 1849 the Livlandic nobility passed a temporary reform measure that permitted peasants to purchase the holdings they were working. This law was made permanent in 1860 in Livland, and in 1863 in Kurland. By 1905, 38.0% of all arable land in Kurland, and 37.0% in Livland, was in the hands of peasant owner–operators. Even by 1905, however, approximately four-fifths of all peasant families in Kurland and Livland still did not own land (Boruks, 1995, p. 207). Evidence of land sales in Kurland allows us to view the extent of privatization and some of its probable effects (Boruks, 1995; Courland Land Sales, 1865–1872, 1865–1885, Tables 11–12, pp. 163–164; Courland Statistical Committee, 1884, Table I, 1–43). Data on aggregate land sales within 420 private estates in Kurland's ten districts between 1865 and 1885 indicate that peasants steadily and increasingly availed themselves of the opportunity to buy farmsteads. During those years, Kurland peasants purchased more than 8900 farmsteads. It is impossible to determine precisely what proportion of all farms that represents, but it was unquestionably very high. The provincial census of 1881 for nine of Kurland's ten districts enumerated more than 9100 farmsteads. Assuming a similar number of private farmsteads in the remaining district, there were perhaps 10,000 peasant-run farmsteads on private estates in Kurland in 1881. As the number of farmsteads changed only very little in Baltic landed estates, we can rule out any significant fluctuations in that basic estimate of 10,000 (Plakans & Wetherell, 1988). Accordingly, perhaps 90% of all peasant-run farmsteads on private estates were sold by 1885. As sales continued into the 1890s, it is reasonable to assume that virtually all farmsteads that had been in private estate hands in 1850 were in peasant hands by 1900.

Importantly, the aggregate record of land sales and the individual records of farmstead purchasers does not suggest an active land market in which holdings were either consolidated or divided. Alleviating the great inequality of landholding was, and continued to be, a point driving reform in the provincial government. But on average, nearly 80% of the buyers of farmsteads in Kurland between 1865 and 1885 were the former renters of those farms. Another 15% were other farmers, undoubtedly farmhands, and only 5% were other persons. At most then, only 20% of the sales went to those not occupying the farmstead at the time of the sale.

The transfer of land from estate to private hands between 1860 and 1900 did nothing to alter the basic dynamic of the agricultural labour market. Little new land became available for the large population of farmhands in the region. Mobile agricultural labourers were still faced with the task of finding work for themselves and their families; the only real difference after 1860 was that labour market had expanded geographically to the provincial level. The land sale laws were accompanied by substantial relaxation of restrictions against long-distance movement. Starting in the 1860s, farmhands and their families were free to move around the region since they were no longer confined to individual estates.

Material from the first and only Russian Imperial Census in 1897 shows that geographic mobility had become substantially higher that the pre-1860 levels we observed in Pinkenhof. In the Livland township (*pagasts*) of Kokenhof, for example, the 1897 census enumerated 1718 people. For 1697 of these we know place of birth, age, and gender. Some 51.0% (871) of these 1697 had been born elsewhere (for a CMR of 5l.0). Since in Pinkenhof in 1850, nearly half (47.4%) of those over 18 had moved within the estate between 1833 and 1850, it is safe to conclude that by 1897 rural rates of migration had not subsided from pre-1860 levels and, indeed, very likely had increased substantially. Table 3 displays the age profile of migrants in Kokenhof. It is important to remember that the age-specific rates do not reflect movement in the various age cohorts. Rather, as in the Pinkenhof case, the rates only reveal that those in each age cohort had moved into Kokenhof by 1897; at what ages that migration took place is impossible to say at this time. That

Table 3
Hypothetical age-specific migration rates, Kokenhof (1897) and Pinkenhof (1850)

Age cohort	Total population	Migrants	External immigration	Internal migration, Pinkenhof
0–4	211	43	20.4	
5–9	196	72	36.7	
10–14	163	73	44.8	
15–19	209	110	52.6	
20–24	131	86	65.6	31.6
25–29	98	62	63.3	30.6
30–34	65	42	64.6	32.0
35–39	135	85	63.0	27.8
40–44	115	78	67.8	23.0
45–49	91	53	58.2	25.5
50–54	55	28	50.9	23.9
55–59	61	32	52.5	
60–64	64	40	62.5	
65+	103	62	60.2	
Totals	1,697	866	51.0	

Sources: (Pinkenhof, 1850; Kokenhof, 1897).

the Kokenhof rates are in the order of twice as high as those for Pinkenhof suggest that the latter underestimate internal movement. The Kokenhof rates also do not include any kind of internal migration within the township, and therefore may well underestimate labour force migration. At the same time, the rates include marriage migration. Neither component of the overall migration — marriage and labour force migration — can be determined, and the figures for Kokenhof speak solely to the overall migratory experience.

The basic conditions that drove the (internal) migration of landless farmhands and agricultural works in Pinkenhof at mid-century still existed and arguably underlay the (external) migration in Kokenhof at the end of the 19th century. Access to private landholding was still limited, and the evidence of lands sales indicates that few farmhands joined the ranks of the private landholders, confirming that the problem of the "landless" was real, and that the rural migration that reflected the problem had increased in the late third of the 19th century. In contrast with Pinkenhof in the first half of the century, the Kokenhof population in 1897 reveals a robust proportion of in-migrants (who were out-migrants from other places) in the most important population groupings (see Table 4).

In virtually every category after the age groups 0–19, more than half of the population was born somewhere else. In Pinkenhof, such proportions would have been impossible because of the restrictions on migration. In Kokenhof, however, the 1860s relaxation of migration restrictions, and the possibility of land ownership, had produced by 1897 a local community in which something like 6 to 8 persons over the age of 20 had started life somewhere else.

4. Agrarian reform in the 20th century

In order to demonstrate that the second half of the 19th century was something of a transition period with respect to migration and its social consequences, let us briefly consider the next large set of reforms in the early 1920s, which took

Table 4
Proportion of migrants in Kokenhof (1897) by age and sex

Age cohort	% migrants	Males (% migrants)	Females (% migrants)
0–9	28.5	27.5	11.6
10–19	48.8	48.3	50.0
20–29	64.5	58.8	69.0
30–39	63.7	57.0	65.0
40–49	63.3	59.0	68.3
50–59	51.7	49.1	54.4
60–69	62.4	62.2	61.9
70–79	54.3	44.4	68.4
80+	71.4	57.1	78.5

Source: Kokenhof (1897).

Table 5
Sizes of new farms created by Latvian Land Reforms 1919–1939

Size of holdings		Number of holdings	
Hectares	Acres	*N*	%
0–9	0–22	3508	6.4
10–15	25–37	12,490	22.9
16–22	40–54	31,187	57.4
23+	57+	7251	13.3
Totals		54,436	100.0

Source: Salnais and Maldups (1936). Notes: 1 ha=2.471 acres.

place after the province of Livland had become a component of the new Republic of Latvia. The land reforms of the 1920s were the most sweeping to date, and they altered rural life in fundamental ways. Those reforms involved the confiscation of private estate and county land and the redistribution of that land to landless peasants. Between 1919 and 1937 in Latvia alone, 4.2 million acres passed into private hands after confiscation from large state and private holdings (Indian Society of Agricultural Economics, 1946, 85–9 1). The extant records of the reform indicate that of the 144,640 parcels with identifiable recipients, more than a third (55,963 or 38.7%) went specifically to create entirely new farms, and another fifth (31,023 or 21.4%) went to supplement existing farms. Altogether then, more than three-fifths (86,986 or 60.1%) of all new parcels went to create new farms or to augment older farms. Among identifiable recipients of land, almost half (71,115 of 144,640 or 49.1%) were designated as "landless," and approximated the proportion of farmhands in Pinkenhof in 1850. Another quarter (33,804 or 23.4%) were former members of the military and undoubtedly landless, and the remaining quarter (39,721 or 27.5%) were long-time users. Thus three-quarters of those receiving land had been landless prior to reform.

The reforms of the 1920s created more small holdings than ever before. Because the sales in the 1870s and 1880s transferred ownership of existing farmsteads to peasants, the holdings tended to be relatively large. In wheat-growing Kurland, holdings sold between 1865 and 1885 averaged 115 acres *(s*=11.2). Fully fledged farmsteads in Pinkenhof averaged nearly 54 acres in 1809, which was at the upper end of the distribution of holdings created by the 1920s reforms (Plakans & Wetherell, 1992, Table 1, p. 204). As Table 5 reveals, the vast majority of new holdings (80.3%) were between 25 and 54 acres; more than half were between 40 and 54 acres. Enough farms were created in the 1920s to indicate that the sizes of farms in the Baltic decreased from pre-privatization and even pre-emancipation levels. Provisions of reforms, moreover, put a ceiling on the amount of land that could be inherited at 50 ha, or 123 acres. It

Table 6
Household size and composition Latvia (1935), Kokenhof (1897), and Pinkenhof (1850, 1935)

Household size	Latvia	Pinkenhof	Kokenhof	Pinkenhof
	1935	1935	1897	1850
	%	%	%	%
1–2	10.9	13.2	3.6	2.7
3–5	49.2	51.2	6.0	4.5
6–10	35.1	33.1	12.0	28.6
11+	4.8	2.5	78.4	64.2
Totals	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	225,496[1,2]	393[3]	84[4]	112[4]
Household composition				
1 Family	80.2		16.7	11.8
2 Families	13.8		17.9	14.3
3 Families	3.6		27.4	23.5
4+ Families	2.4		38.0	50.4
Totals	100.0		100.0	100.0
N	225,442[2]		84[4]	119[1]

Sources: (Pinkenhof, 1850, 1935; Kokenhof, 1897; Salnais and Maldups, 1936]; Latvia, 1936).
Notes: 1. Includes all rural sites; 2. discrepancy exists in source; 3. includes all sites; 4. includes only farms.

was, of course, possible to accumulate additional land for sons, but, given the constraints on farm size, parents could probably not provide land to more than two sons under the best of circumstances. In the absence of agricultural specialization — and only slightly more than 2% of all new parcels went to truck and specialty farms (3159 of 144,640 or 2.2%) — the distribution of new land holdings logically created pressure to curtail fertility as small holdings could not readily be divided into self-sustaining farms. Small holdings also worked to make multiple family households less feasible and small, nuclear family farms, more attractive, which indeed was what happened.

The impact of the 1920s reforms in Latvia were profound. A census of 1935 enumerated not only the 1.2 million people in rural Latvia but also the numbers of "new" and "old" farms in 516 rural districts in the new country's four regions, Kurzeme, Latgale, Vidzeme, and Zemgale (Latvia 1938). In comparison to 129,123 "old" farms, there were 57,865 "new" farms. Thus of the 225,521 rural "sites" in Latvia in 1935, more than 80% were farms (186,988 or 82.9%). And of all farms, 30% (57,865 or 182,988 or 30.9) had been created in the preceding 15 years. As Table 6 reveals, the alteration of household size and composition was no less profound. In 1935 fully 60% of all households contained fewer than six persons; less than 5% contained 11 or more. Manuscript schedules of the 1935 census for Pinkenhof (which was now part of a larger administrative unit called Babite *pagasts*) allow a comparison with 1850 (Pinkenhof, 1850, 1935). In 1850, Pinkenhof had 102 farmsteads with identifiable heads; in 1935 Babite township contained 393 separate households. The proportions of households of different sizes in 1935 reflect a complete reversal of the situation that had prevailed in the mid-19th century. In 1850 less than 3% of farmstead households contained 3–5 people while in 1935 more than 50% did. Similarly only 2.5% of all farmsteads contained 11 or more persons in 1935, while in 1850 nearly 70% did. Household complexity had also declined drastically by 1935. Whereas in 1850, only 11% of Pinkenhof residences were single family households, by 1935 in Babite township, fully 80% were. It can be surmised that the redistribution of land in the 1920s acted to suppress migration because it provided a heretofore mobile population with private holdings and in so doing altered the rationale underlying the labour force migration that had existed for more than a century.

Acknowledgements

An earlier version of this article was presented at the 19th International Congress of Historical Sciences, Oslo, Norway, August 6–13, 2000. The author is profoundly grateful to Charles Wetherell for his contribution to the research in the present article, and for his part in the long-term collaborative investigations of Pinkenhof estate.

References

Boruks, A. (1995). *Zemnieks, zeme, un zemkopiba LatvUa.* : Riga.

Courland Land Sales. (1865–1872). Latvian National History Archive, Collection 218, Items 88 19-8844.

Courland Land Sales. (1865–1885). Latvian National Archive, Collection 416, Item 134, 57–62.

Courland Statistical Committee. (1884). *Ergebnisse der baltischen Volkszahlung vom 29. December 1881, Part III: Ergebnisee der kurlandischen Volkszahlung,* Vol. 1, *Die Zahlung aufdem Lande und in den Flecken.* Mitau.

Indian Society of Agricultural Economics. (1946). *Agrarian Reforms in Western Countries* (Bombay: Vora).

Kertzer, D. I., & Hogan, D. P. (1985). On the move: Migration in an Italian Community, 1865–1921. *Social Science History*, *9*, 1−23.

Kertzer, D. I., & Hogan, D. P. (1989). *Family, political economy, and demographic change: The transformation of life in Casalecchio, Italy, 1816–1921.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Kertzer, D. I., & Hogan, D. P. (1990). Household organization and migration in nineteenth century Italy. *Social Science History*, *14*, 483−505.

Kokenhof. (1897). Erste Allgemeine Volkszahlung des Russisehen Reiches, 1897, Kokenhof. Latvian National Historical Archives. Riga. Fond 2706, apr, 1, lieta 222.

Kundzins, P. (1974). *Latvju seta [The Latvian Farmstead].* Stockholm: Daugava.

Latvia. (1935). *LatvUas agrara reforma: agraras reformas izvesanas darbu noslegums* [*Agrarian Reform in Latvia: The Results of the Agrarian Reform*] (Riga:Zemkopibas ministrija, 1938), 187–401.

Moch, L. P. (1992). *Moving Europeans: Migration in Western Europe since 1650.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Pinkenhof. (1833). Eighth Imperial Revision, Central National Historical Archive, Riga, Latvia. Baltic Microfilms, Dl 12, Oekeonomie-Expedition d. StadtCassa Collegiums IV. E.4, Revisionsliste Gut Pinkenhof, 3. G. Herder Institute, Marburg a.d Lahn, Germany.

Pinkenhof. (1850). Ninth Imperial Revision, Central National Historical Archive, Riga, Latvia. Baltic Microfilms, Dl 12, Oekeonomie-Expedition d. StadtCassa Collegiums IV. E.4, Revisionsliste Gut Pinkenhof, J. G. Herder Institute, Marburg a.d Lahn, Germany.

Pinkenhof. (1935). Vaists statistiska parvalde. 1935. gada tautas skaitisana. [National Statistical Agency. Census of 1935.]. Fond 1308. Apraksts 121. Lieta 13608.Babite pagasts. National Historical Archive of Latvia, Riga.

Plakans, A., & Wetherell, C. (1988). The Kinship domain in an East European peasant community: Pinkenhof, 1833–1850. *American Historical Review*, *93*, 359−386.

Plakans, A., & Wetherell, C. (1992). Family and economy in an early nineteenth-century Baltic Serf Estate. *Continuity and Change*, *7*, 199−223.

Plakans, A., & Wetherell, C. (1995). Migration in the later years of life in traditional Europe. In D. Kertzer & P. Laslett (Eds.), *Aging in the past: Demography, society, and old age* (pp. 156−174). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Rogers, A., & Castro, L. J. (1986). Migration. In A. Rogers & F. J. Willekens (Eds.), *Migration and settlement: A multiregional comparative study* (pp. 157−208). Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel.

Salnais, V., & Maldups, A. (1936). *Lauku apdzivotas vietas pee 1935.g. tautas skaitisanas materialiem [Inhabited Places in Rural Areas According to the Materials of the 1935 census]*. Riga: Vaists statistiska parvalde.

Schwabe, A. (1928). *Grundriss der Agrargeschichte Lettlands.* Riga: Bernhard Lamey.

Svarane, M. (1971). *Saimnieks un kaips Kurzeme un Vidzeme XIX gadsimta vidu [Farmstead Heads and Farmhands in Kurland and Livland in the Mid-Nineteenth Century].* Riga: Zinatne.

Tilly, C. (1978). Migration in modern European history. In W. F. T. McNeil & R. S. Adams (Eds.), *Human migration: Patterns and policies* (pp. 48−72). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Tobien, A. von. (1899). *Die Agrargesetzgebung Livlands im 19.* Jahrhundert. Vol.1. Berlin.

Wetherell, C., & Plakans, A. (1997). Fertility and culture in Eastern Europe: A case study of Riga, Latvia, 1867–188 1. *European Journal of Population*, *13*, 243−268.

Wetherell, C., & Plakans, A. (1998). Intergenerational transfers of headships over the life course in an Eastern European Peasant Community, 1782–1850. *History of the Family: An international quarterly*, *3*, 333−349.